

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/648,290 08/24/00 MAEDA

H OPS CASE 50

PM82/1003

FLYNN THIEL BOUTELL & TANIS PC  
2026 RAMBLING ROAD  
KALAMAZOO MI 49008-1699

EXAMINER

BROADHEAD, B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3661

DATE MAILED:

10/03/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/648,290	MAEDA, HIROYUKI
Examiner	Art Unit	
Brian J. Broadhead	3661	

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 April 2001.

2a) This action is FINAL.      2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on 4-23-01 is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.  
    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
    a) All b) Some \* c) None of:  
        1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
        2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
        3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
    \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
    a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

Art Unit: 3661

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 1, 2, 6, and 7 are rejected as indefinite for containing the limitation "and/or". Use of this claim language renders the claim indefinite because it cannot be determined if control over both the front and rear wheels is necessary or optional. The other claims are rejected for being dependant on the indefinite claims.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-4, 6, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over James, 5420794, in view of the admitted prior art.

5. James discloses a transmitter provided on a road for transmitting a signal formed of an electromagnetic wave on lines 15-18, on column 2; the automatic braking device and a receiver being provided in a vehicle wherein the braking device drives a pump in order to operate an automatic brake to wheel brake provided in a pair of right and left

Art Unit: 3661

front wheels or rear wheels on lines 25-28, on column 2, the brakes are a hydraulic and it is inherent that there is some type of pump connected to operate the brakes automatically; the receiver outputting a control signal based on the signal transmitted by the transmitter on lines 52-61, on column 5; the automatic braking device is operated based on the control signals on lines 35-43, on column 5; the automatic braking device is operated based on a reference value corresponding to a target traveling speed set by the reference value setting means based on the control signal on lines 45-52, on column 7; there is a vehicle speed detection means on lines 12-25, on column 6; a temperature detection means on the road for detecting the atmospheric temperature reaches a given temperature and outputting a temperature signal that is transmitted to the vehicle on lines 35-50, on column 6, weather and road conditions would include temperature; and an alarm is given to the inside of the vehicle based on the control signal outputted by the receiver on lines 53-67, on column 6. James does not disclose that the brakes are anti-lock brakes. It is admitted by the applicant that in the prior art there has been proposed an automatic braking device for operating a brake automatically to a vehicle regardless of intention of a driver and that an automatic braking device of this type can be structured on the basis of a conventional antilock brake control device on lines 14-18, on page 1 of the specification. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use anti-lock brakes in the invention of James because anti-lock brakes are known to offer superior control by preventing wheel lockup and they are becoming standard equipment on vehicles.

***Conclusion***

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
7. Testa, 6166658, discloses a speed limit control system.
8. Gehlot, 6163277, discloses a system and method for speed limit enforcement.
9. Heggestad et al., 5533695, discloses an incremental train control system.
10. Ohmura et al., 6208932, discloses a navigation apparatus.
11. Cooper, 5786750, discloses a pilot vehicle which is useful for monitoring hazardous conditions on railroad tracks.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian J. Broadhead whose telephone number is 703-308-9033. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William A. Cuchlinski can be reached on 703-308-3873. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-305-7687 for regular communications and 703-305-7687 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1113.

Application/Control Number: 09/648,290  
Art Unit: 3661

Page 5

BJB  
September 27, 2001

Jacques H. Louis-Jacques  
PRIMARY EXAMINER